



**Certification under 37 CFR**

# 7 Key for response.  
Sno 12-14-99

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with The United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelop addressed to The Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on December 6, 1999.

Thomas F. Peterson  
Name

*Thomas F. Peterson*  
Signature

DOCKET: CU- 1561

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPLICANT: David Victor LARSEN et al. )  
SERIAL NO: 08/849,875 )  
FILED: June 18, 1997 )  
TITLE: MULTI-HOP PACKET RADIO NETWORKS )

RECEIVED  
DEC 13 1999  
ECON CENTER 2000  
Group Art Unit: 2733  
Examiner: Lee

THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This Amendment is in response to the outstanding Official Action mailed August 4, 1999. The initial term for response expired on November 4, 1999.

Applicant is simultaneously requesting a one month extension of the term for response up to December 4, 1999. December 4, 1999 fell on a Saturday. Therefore the one month extended term for response expires on Monday, December 6, 1999. Enclosed herewith are duplicate copies of the request for a one month extension of term, and a check in the amount of \$55.00 to cover the cost of said extension.

**REMARKS**

The Official Action indicates that claims 1-45 are pending in the application, but claims 17-45 have been withdrawn from consideration in response to an election made on June 1, 1999. In response to the Official Action, the Applicant maintains the claims in the form presently on file. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Claims 1-6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spiegel et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,649,108.

Spiegel et al. relates to a connection oriented network, such as an asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) network using progressive or originating control protocols (column 1, lines 8-13). A network of this type does not have a dynamically varying architecture or topology. This is demonstrated by the fact that it is impossible to obtain, with a dynamic varying network, a map of the network topology as carried out in the routing protocols mentioned by Spiegel et al. (column 1, lines 38-44). Moreover, it is